

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](https://paypal.me/robbradshaw)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Evangelical Quarterly* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_evangelical_quarterly.php

The Evangelical Quarterly

JULY 15TH, 1930

THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE SITE OF ZION AND OTHER BIBLICAL SITES IN AND AROUND JERUSALEM

THOUGH in Jerusalem and its vicinity there are many Biblical sites of the greatest interest to Bible students and sacred to all Christian peoples, it is a remarkable fact that very few of these have been identified with certainty.

No identification has been more keenly debated than that of the site of the ancient Zion itself, the City of David, the City of the Jebusites. It is probably still keenly contested by those who have pinned their faith to the western hill where is the modern Protestant cemetery, and which has long been known as Zion Hill, though erroneously so. The name Zion has now become so attached to it that, despite recent discoveries, it will probably continue to be handed down as the site of the ancient city: and no amount of discussion will remove the name to Ophel, the eastern hill, to which it properly belongs.

Other sites are just as keenly contested. Six different identifications are offered for the Pool of Bethesda, each upheld chiefly by that branch of the Christian Church on whose ground the supposed Pool is situated. The keen desire for Holy Places associated with the various Churches is responsible for much of this multiplicity of identification. Directly a possible Holy Place has been discovered, it has been converted into a Sanctuary by the erection of a Church over or near to it; and occasionally Holy Places have been discovered and identified after ground has been acquired for the building of a Church. Thus, to forestall this tendency of the Christian Churches and prevent friction, when the Church of Eudoxia was discovered by Dr. Bliss beside the Pool of Siloam, the Turkish Government promptly erected a minaret on the spot, thus converting it into a Moslem Holy Place and so making it impossible for the Christian Churches to dispute its possession.

The difficulty of identifying Biblical sites in and around Jerusalem is further increased by the constant changes of occupation and the turmoil and upheavals of war. Though it is the City of Peace, Jerusalem has never known peace for any lengthened period, and successive civilisations are piled above each other. Its ruins are therefore a confused mass of mixed materials belonging to every period since it first became a city.

The interest in Holy Places and New Testament sites also did not awaken in the Christian Church till probably the third or fourth century A.D. The process of identification, therefore, has not received much help from local tradition and constant occupation makes discovery or verification by excavation in most cases impossible.

In the following pages I give a fair statement of some of the Holy Places or sites popularly identified as so, and it will be seen that there are very few which can be regarded as indisputably correct locations. Some of these are dealt with in my *Accuracy of the Old Testament* recently published.

ZION . . . CITY OF DAVID

The name of the original City of Jerusalem is given in the Tell el Amarna Letters of the fifteenth century B.C. as Urusalim. In the Old Testament it is described as Jebus, the stronghold of the Jebusites.

After its capture by King David about 1050 B.C. it became known as Zion, the City of David.

We should note here that in the Old Testament the Jebusites are described as a branch of the Canaanites and are in fact Canaanites. Their pottery, utensils, their weapons, tools and mode of life were Canaanite. We merely use the word Jebusite to describe the Canaanite people who dwelt in Jerusalem when David took it.

On the site of the original Zion, the City of David, we ought therefore to find :

1. Traces of Jebusite Fortifications.
2. Jebusite pottery and other evidences of the presence of the Jebusites at least some years before David took it.
3. Traces of Hebrew Walls, Fortifications and Masonry.

4. Hebrew pottery of at least 1000 B.C. and from that period downwards.

5. If the statement in Joshua xv. 63 and Judges i. 21 that the Jebusites were retained and dwelt in the city along with the Hebrews, is correct, we ought to find Jebusite and Hebrew pottery mixed in the rubbish heaps outside of the city boundaries.

6. Our knowledge of Jerusalem gained from Egyptian Monuments as well as the Old Testament would lead us also to expect to find indications of Egyptian influence, and civilisation.

In our recent excavations on Ophel all these evidences have been found.

The Jebusite Wall and Bastions of 1200 B.C. with a Tower inserted by David and repaired by Solomon and probably by Nehemiah are now a National Monument.

This Wall and Tower is in fact one of the few authentic antiquities in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. It is the wall which faced David when he took the stronghold, and on the top of this wall the people sat listening to the Rabshakeh, as recorded in 2 Kings xviii, who addressed them from the Valley of Kidron underneath or the slope of Siloam Hill across the valley.

Canaanite pottery found on Ophel dating from 3000 B.C. (the Cave-dwelling period) to 1000 B.C. proves constant occupation of this site by the Canaanites.

At 1100 B.C. Israelite masonry and Israelite pottery make their appearance ; and with the Hebrew pottery always a mixture of Jebusite pottery, thus proving the statement of Joshua xv. 63 correct, that the Jebusites remained in the city with the Israelites. Traces of Egyptian influence of the Hebrew period from the ninth century downwards are also quite common.

The evidence of the site itself thus proves that the stronghold of the Jebusites, the kernel of the original Zion, City of David, was on the Eastern Hill now known as "Ophel," and not on the Western Hill, the Neby Daud of today, which has been unwarrantably named "Zion Hill," and is still popularly regarded as "Zion."

The literary evidence leads irresistibly to the same conclusion. The Western Hill does not fit the many references in the Old Testament and elsewhere to the original Zion.¹

¹ See L. B. Paton's *Jerusalem in Bible Times*.

Another point of great significance is the proximity of the spring "Gihon," now known as the Virgin's Fountain, to "Ophel." There is no doubt that the original stronghold was built here, because of the constant supply of water in this perennial and intermittent spring just underneath its walls.

Some time before the Hebrew occupation the Jebusites made a short tunnel in the rock to bring the overflow of Gihon Spring inside their city. From the end of this tunnel they cut a perpendicular shaft towards the surface to a height of about forty to fifty feet ; and from that point they made a great sloping passage in the solid rock which leads into the city. By this passage their women could go down and draw water from the vertical shaft without danger when an enemy was near.

These rock-cuttings were all opened and examined in 1910, but were discovered long before by Sir Charles Warren, whose name has unfortunately been attached to them.

If Gihon Spring had not been regarded as a valuable asset, they would not have bothered to make these great cuttings to secure a water supply inside the city in time of siege.

There is no doubt, therefore, that the original Zion, the Jebusite stronghold, was situated on "Ophel," the Eastern Hill, and not on the Western Hill as is popularly supposed.

The exact limits of the stronghold have now been determined by the discovery of its Western Wall. This Western wall ran along the Western edge of "Ophel" Scar, and certainly did not include the Western Hill. The Western Hill formed no part of the City of David.

If it had, we should find innumerable traces of early Canaanite occupation. So far nothing of an early date has been found on the Western Hill except a few scraps of late Hebrew pottery.

The Western Hill appears to have become an important part of the city only in Maccabaeae times. Pottery dating from the Maccabaeae period downwards is found all over it ; and in deep cuttings for cisterns underneath houses about to be erected, I found no pottery that dated earlier than Maccabaeae times.

The name "Zion" is by some supposed to mean "Waterless," and on this account it is said that the name can be applicable only to the Western Hill, on which no trace of a spring can be found. It is argued also that the Western Hill offers so much finer a site for a stronghold, that we cannot conceive any intelligent body of warriors preferring Ophel.

It is true that the Western Hill offers an almost impregnable position for a stronghold.

It is a great objection, however, that it is by far too large a site for a small body of people to fortify and defend. At 1500 B.C. the Canaanites did not build large cities. The Eastern Hill, "Ophel," if walled round would be only a third smaller than Gezer stronghold and Gezer was an important city in these days. For the reason, therefore, that it would be so much easier to fortify and defend, the spur of Ophel would in those days be the preferable site, especially as it offers an equally, if not a more unassailable position, as well as a ceaseless supply of water.

Further, it is by no means certain that "Zion" means "Waterless." Gesenius gives it as "a sunny spot." This suits Ophel better than the Western Hill, which is a very windy spot. The meaning "Waterless" may have been discovered when it was found necessary to meet the argument, that Ophel was chosen because of the fine supply of water beside it.

The discovery of Canaanite and Hebrew remains, from 3000 B.C. downwards to Roman times establishes beyond all reach of argument the fact that the spur of Ophel was the original "Zion," the "City of David." Even if similar remains and in the same abundance were found on the Western Hill, the only inference possible would be that the early city covered "Ophel" spur and part of the Western Hill as well, but until these proofs be discovered the claim of the Western Hill must be ignored.

POOL OF BETHESDA

Six identifications are suggested for the Pool of Bethesda.

1. The twin pools at the north-west corner of the fort Antonia at the north end of the Temple Platform.

2. Baedeker (p. 55) gives the Pool just outside of the north wall of the Haram-esh-sharif (Temple Plateau). This is a cistern 121 yards long and 42 yards wide. There is no spring in it and seldom any water. It has also been identified as the Sheep Pool and is now known as the Pool of Israel (Birket Isra'in).

3. The Hammam Esh-shifa, "the healing bath," to the right of the cotton merchants' bazaar, is another identification proposed (Baed., p. 56). How long the healing tradition has been associated with it we cannot say. It is probably of recent date. This is really a cistern for collecting rain and the water

is bad. Perhaps that is the origin of the healing tradition which it still retains.

4. The Pool shown inside the grounds of the Church of St. Anne is really a cistern covered with plaster of the Crusading period. It may date from Roman or Byzantine times, but it is simply a rain-fed cistern.

5. The Pool of Siloam.

6. The Virgin's Fountain or Gihon Spring.

In the various texts and early writings the name appears in the forms Bethesda, Bethzatha, Bethsaida, Bezatha and Belzetha.

Bethesda may mean the "House of Mercy"; or as in mediæval tradition, "the House of Outpouring."

Bethsaida means "House of hunting or fishing," or may be badly transliterated into Greek from the Hebrew "Bethzaitha," "House of Olives."

Bethzatha was the name of the portion of the city north of the Temple Area and is the best supported reading.

In John v. 7 it is plainly implied that this Pool of Bethesda was "troubled" or in violent commotion at times; and also that these moments of commotion could not be timed. This commotion also implied a rise, a sudden increase in the depth of the pool which varied at different times. If this were not so, the impotent man could have sat within easy reach of the edge of the water, where no one could have forstalled him. He remained at a safe distance for a good reason. If he were too near, the flow of water might be so deep as to overwhelm and drown him. He had perforce also to remain above the highest known level of the flow of the spring for the same reason.

It is clear, therefore, that the narrative points to an intermittent spring, whose water had a miraculous power of healing the person who first dipped in its flow.

The Virgin's Fountain is the only intermittent spring known to us in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. It must therefore have been the Pool of Bethesda.

Our Lord visited very few places in Jerusalem. Inside the city his movements were confined mainly to the Temple Area and the House of the Last Supper. Outside He certainly visited Olivet, Gethsemane and the Pool of Siloam. The Virgin's Fountain feeds the Pool of Siloam and its water has still the reputation of healing. The Jews of today believe its water cures rheumatic complaints.

Either interpretation of the name Bethesda will suit it. The East wall of the city of Christ's day is just above it and the sheep market was probably held beside it. The five porticoes may be buried under the accumulated rubbish that has slipped down the west slope of the Kidron valley from outside the city wall. Excavation there would probably reveal what is left of these five porches.

The name Bethzatha, which is authenticated from at least the early part of the fourth century A.D., suggests that the Pool was at that early date regarded as situated in the district of Bethzatha, north of the Temple Area. If this is correct, there must have been an intermittent spring there in our Lord's day which has since dried up. No trace of such a spring has been found.

The Pool of Siloam may have been the place with the five porticoes, where the impotent folk lay waiting for the rush of water to come down from the Virgin's Fountain by Hezekiah's Tunnel; but the name Siloam was well known in Christ's day (see John ix. 7), and Bethesda cannot be the Hebrew form of Siloam.

If Siloam was meant in John v. 2, the writer would have called it Siloam and not Bethesda; or he would have added that Bethesda and Siloam were identical.

Yet it is significant that our Lord sent the blind man of John ix. 7 to wash his eyes in Siloam Pool, the water of Siloam being the same water of the Virgin's Fountain and evidently regarded as possessing the same healing power at that time.

POOL OF SILOAM AND HEZEKIAH'S TUNNEL

The Pool of Siloam is another of the few undisputed identifications in the vicinity of Jerusalem.

The water is brought from the Virgin's Fountain by a tunnel cut in the solid rock 1,800 feet in length. The first forty feet of this tunnel, as mentioned above, was cut by the Jebusites to bring the water into their city. It ended in a perpendicular shaft, to which a great rock-cut sloping underground passage led down from the heart of the city.

This forty foot tunnel was at a later date continued right down to the lower end of the Tyropæon Valley and made to bring the water into a large stone-built reservoir *inside the walls*

of the city, where the women could draw water without the inconvenience of passing down the underground sloping passage.

It is generally supposed that Hezekiah made this tunnel as indicated in 2 Chron. xxxii. 30. It was a great improvement on the Jebusite water system.

One passage in Isaiah (viii. 6) is supposed to indicate that this tunnel or conduit existed before Hezekiah's time and may date as early as the time of Solomon. It speaks of "the waters of Shiloah that go softly" and seems to refer to this underground tunnel. Even if this passage dates before Hezekiah's time, and belongs to the time of Ahaz, his father, there is nothing inconsistent with Hezekiah's having carried out this work during the reign of his father.

2 Chron. xxxii. 30 certainly attributes it to Hezekiah. The words "stopped the upper water-course of Gihon" must mean, either that he no longer allowed the overflow of Gihon to run down the Kidron Valley in a surface channel—"the brook that ran through the midst of the land" of 2 Chron. xxxii. 4: or it may mean that he walled up the perpendicular shaft at the end of the first forty feet of the tunnel, the portion which he found already made by the Jebusites. Perhaps it means both. This shaft has certainly been walled up to a height of about six feet, as can be seen today.

2 Kings xx. 20 also credits Hezekiah with having made "a pool and a conduit, and having brought the water into the city."

According to both Kings and Chronicles, therefore, Hezekiah made a Pool of Siloam and completed the tunnel, which brought the waters of Gihon down to it.

There are two Pools of Siloam. The old one known as the Birket el Hamra or Red Pool is still visible though now practically filled up with earth and used as a garden.

This "Red Pool" was in existence before Hezekiah's time and was fed from the overflow of Gihon Spring by a channel running down the edge of the slope on the surface of the ground. As it was situated too far out from the Rock where his tunnel ends, Hezekiah discarded it, and made the new Pool close to the end of his tunnel. The present Pool as now seen is only half the size of the original and was restored not so many years ago.

The identification of Siloam Pool is authenticated by many literary evidences, apart from its situation at the end of Hezekiah's Tunnel.

Neh. iii. 15 locates the Pool of Shelah between the Fountain Gate and the King's Garden. This fits the present position of the Pool.

In Neh. ii. 14 it is called the King's Pool.

Isaiah xxii. 9, 11 says Hezekiah "stopped the waters of the lower Pool (i.e. the old Pool) and made a reservoir for them between the two walls." This reservoir is the new Pool of Siloam (L. B. Paton, p. 41).

Luke xiii. 4 and John ix. 7 mention the Pool of Siloam and the word used in John ix. 7 shows it was not a spring.

Josephus (War V. 4. 1) places Siloam at the southern end of the Tyropœon Valley, and calls it "a Fountain with much sweet water."

In another passage (War V. 4. 1) he describes it as "a Spring outside of the city."

He is obviously locating Siloam in its present position but is borrowing his description from the Spring Gihon which feeds it through the tunnel.

His description of the water as "sweet" is the usual description of ancient times. The water today, however, has a brackish taste and is not much used for drinking.

As the water of Gihon is never referred to in the Old Testament as bitter or brackish, the Spring must have developed this feature at a later date. It is probably due to decayed vegetation or to the sewage with which the gardens on Ophel are copiously irrigated.

HEZEKIAH'S TUNNEL

The Tunnel, the first part of which was excavated before Hezekiah's time, is about 1,800 feet long.

It was recently (1910) cleared out so that now anyone may walk the whole length.

It is a very interesting experience to go through it, if one does not mind walking in a foot and a half of water and mud for an hour.

At the Virgin's Fountain one has to walk across the Pool, which may be three feet deep, to the mouth of the Tunnel. At this end the entrance to the Tunnel is only about five feet high: and the average breadth all through is just enough for one person to walk without one's elbows touching the sides.

After a short distance it is higher and people of average height can walk through quite easily.

If a trip through be arranged, one should be careful to go after the women at Siloam Pool have drawn their supply of water for the day. It is best to go in the evening. Candles or flash torches are necessary anyhow and when people emerge bedraggled it is not so noticeable in the dark.

It is well also to post a guard at the exit, as the natives have been known to hold a party prisoners in the Tunnel for hours with the object of extorting bakshish.

The cutting is interesting all through but the main interest centres chiefly in the famous Siloam Inscription. This was carved in old Hebrew characters on the side of the Tunnel a few yards in from the Siloam end ; and described how the workmen began to work from both ends, nearly missing each other when they met. By listening for "the noise of pick against pick" they at last succeeded in meeting after several ineffectual attempts.

This inscription has been cut out and is now in the Museum at Constantinople. Only the niche where it was is left.

The other parts of special interest are the points where they tried to meet ; and the point where the Jebusite vertical shaft was cut. This is described above.

For several yards in from the Siloam end the Tunnel has been cut to about twenty feet or more in height. This heightening is the work of a later, the Byzantine, period.

GIHON SPRING AND EN ROGEL

These two may also be regarded as correctly identified.

As already indicated, the Gihon Spring must have been what is now known as the Virgin's Fountain, and in Christ's day was known as the Pool of Bethesda.

There are only two springs mentioned in the Old Testament. The one is known as the Virgin's Fountain and the other as the Well of Job. As the word "Gihon" means "Gusher" and 2 Chron. xxxii. 30 implies that Gihon was a spring, it must be one of these two : and the Virgin's Fountain is the one which alone suits the Biblical references. Josephus speaks of it as a "Fountain" or "Spring." 2 Chron. xxxii. 30 implies it was a Spring and the Well of Job would not fit this passage, situated as it is to the south of Siloam Pool. This passage in fact fixes the Virgin's Fountain as Gihon beyond dispute, since the conduit,

known as Hezekiah's Tunnel, runs from it to Siloam. The passage means that the overflow of Gihon had been running down to the old Pool of Siloam in a surface channel but Hezekiah stopped that, closed up the spring and ran the water to Siloam by an underground tunnel.

2 Chron. xxxiii. 14 also fixes Gihon as being in the "Brook" of Kidron, that is in the bottom of the Kidron Valley. This identification satisfies also 1 Kings i. 9, 33 and 41.

EN-ROGEL must therefore be identified with the Well of Job.

This identification suits all the references in the Old Testament—Josh. xv. 7; xviii. 16; 2 Sam. xvii. 17; and 1 Kings i. 9.

The crux passage for the identification of these two Springs is 1 Kings i. Verses 9 to 25 inform us that Adonijah was proclaimed King at En-rogel. In verses 33 to 34 Solomon is proclaimed King at Gihon. As springs have been "Holy Places" for the Hebrews from far back antiquity, Gihon and En-rogel were the natural places to be chosen for such a sacred function.

Adonijah chose En-rogel because it was out of sight of the city and yet near enough for his purpose. At verses 40 to 41 we learn that he and his friends heard the rejoicing at Gihon over the coronation of Solomon. They could hear the sounds but could not see what was going on.

This exactly suits the relative positions of the Well of Job and the Virgin's Fountain.

Though not a mile apart, the former is round the corner of the hill on which the modern village of Siloam stands. The one is invisible from the other.

As Adonijah did not want his proceedings to be visible from the City of David he chose the Well of Job, which must therefore be En-rogel.

At the Virgin's Fountain all the doings of his party could have been seen from the wall of the City of David.

This suits also 2 Sam. xvii. 17.

VALLEYS

KIDRON VALLEY AND BROOK. Both of these are correctly identified.

The Kidron Valley is a valley now known as the "Wady Sitt Maryam," "Valley of the Lady Mary." It runs round the east and part of the south side of the city from above St. Stephen's Gate to the Bir Eyub or Well of Job.

It is regarded as the Valley of Jehoshaphat, the great Valley of Reckoning (Joel iii. 14-17) and for this reason the Eastern slope is crowded with Jewish burials awaiting the Great Day of Jehovah.

The Kidron Brook was the overflow of the Virgin's Fountain, which ran down a surface channel to the old Pool of Siloam before Hezekiah's Tunnel was made to convey the water underground.

In a very heavy rainy season a brook still runs the whole length of the valley which drains off the rain from its slopes, but except in the rain season the brook is dry.

In the Old Testament the word used for the Kidron is always Nahal, "a Brook," as if the Valley and the Brook are synonymous (2 Chron. xxxiii. 14).

THE TYROPŒON VALLEY. This name is first found in Josephus (War V. 4. 1). He describes it as the valley which separates the Upper and the Lower Cities. It is now known as El Wad, "The Valley." It runs from a little north of Damascus Gate straight through the city, skirting the west side of the Temple Area and the west side of Ophel spur till it joins the Valley of the Kidron at the south end of Ophel. It separates Ophel the Eastern Hill, from the Western Hill now wrongly named Zion Hill. In Herod's time a bridge of several arches led from the upper city across it to the Temple Area. The spring stones of the eastern arch of this bridge are still visible in the Temple wall near to the present Dung Gate. The arch is known as Robinson's Arch after the man who discovered it.

VALE OF HINNOM. The Valley of Hinnom is that now known as the Wady er-Rababi. Beginning a little above the Mamilla Pool it skirts the northern side of the modern city as far as the Jaffa Gate. At that point it is dammed to form the Birket es Sultan. From there it turns southwards and joins the Kidron and Tyropœon Valleys just opposite Job's Well, at the extreme south end of the ancient Zion.

While Kidron is always called Nahal or "Brook" in the Old Testament, Hinnom is always named "Gai" or "Ge"-Hinnom. Gai means a valley but does not imply the presence of a stream.

It was because of the idolatrous practices carried on in this valley that, in later times, Ge-Hinnom came to be used for Hell (Ge-Henna = Ge-Hinnom).

SMALLER VALLEYS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

REPHAIM (Joshua xv. 8 ; xviii. 16). The Valley of Rephaim is the modern Wady el Werd behind the Hill west of the Valley of Hinnom. The present railway station of Jerusalem is situated on the upper end of it. It was part of the boundary between Judah and Benjamin.

Valley of the dead bodies and of the ashes (Jerem. xxxi. 40). This Valley is so far unidentified.

Valley of Jehoshaphat (Joel iii. 14). This Valley was not identified with the Kidron Valley till the fourth century A.D.

THE NORTHERN WALLS

According to Josephus there were three walls guarding the northern and more assailable side of the city in his time. The first or innermost wall appears to have run on a line almost straight from the north end of the Temple enclosure to the Hippicus Tower at the Jaffa Gate.

The line of the second wall has never been determined satisfactorily. Many maintain that it ran on a line very close to the first wall—so close that the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre was outside of it. Others think the second wall ran along the line of the present north wall, and this is highly probable. In this case the Holy Sepulchre cannot be Calvary, as it would be inside the city wall.

The line of the third wall built by Agrippa about 41 A.D. can still be traced. It encloses a suburb which ran a considerable distance north of the present Damascus Gate.

Josephus considered the first wall to date from the time of David and Solomon. There is no evidence for this: and as this wall runs through the heart of the modern city it cannot be verified or disproved by excavation. It is quite likely, however, that Josephus' statement may be true. The ancient Zion must have been extended northwards and there must have been an upper suburban city as early at least as the time of Solomon.

OLIVET AND GETHSEMANE

There is no doubt regarding the identification of the Mount of Olives: and the Garden of Gethsemane, if not the exact spot shown today, must be somewhere near that spot. It was undoubtedly on the lower slope of the Mount, though it may

have been much nearer to the bottom of the Kidron Valley, if not quite at the bottom.

As already stated, the identification of any site in Jerusalem is always obscured and beclouded by the inveterate habit which Christians have of building Churches over the site. When a probable site is discovered, if it is genuine it ought not to be buried under buildings. Such a procedure throws suspicion at once upon the identification and awakens a suspicion as to the purpose in so obscuring it.

If Gethsemane was a garden, it should be a garden still.

If the Church of the Holy Sepulchre occupies the site of Calvary, the buildings have so effectively buried it, that it is quite impossible now to determine whether it stands on Calvary or not.

CALVARY—THE HOLY SEPULCHRE

The place of the Crucifixion cannot be definitely identified until the line of the second wall of Christ's time has been proved beyond doubt.

Those who accept the Holy Sepulchre as the genuine place, believe that the second wall of the city on the north side ran so as to exclude it. If it did so, it can only just have excluded it, and this line does not commend itself from the point of view of strategy. If the builder of the wall intended the wall as a sure defence, he would seem to have been allowing an enemy a considerable advantage by excluding the slope to the north and thus giving him an excellent point of vantage for attack.

The third wall on the north, built by Herod Agrippa I about 44 A.D., can still be traced. Parts of it were recently laid bare near to the Museum. These indicate a line of wall of drafted Herodian masonry running due south through the playground of the English Boys' School and up to the Italian Hospital. There it turns and passes through beneath the residence of the Head of the London Jewish Society, where it forms part of the wall of the cistern under the building. From that point it finds its way back towards the Jaffa Gate, the definite line not being yet discovered.

This third wall enclosed a large area north of the present Damascus Gate. It is, of course, later than Christ's time, but its importance lies in that it indicates that the second wall must have run on the line of the present north wall and thus enclosed

the Holy Sepulchre. The Church of the Holy Sepulchre in this supposition cannot mark the place of our Lord's Crucifixion, since it would have been inside the city.

The problem of the location of the place of the Crucifixion is thus inseparable from the problem of the line of the north wall of the city in Christ's time. We know that Christ was crucified outside of the city wall of His day, but if it was outside of the northern wall, we do not know definitely the situation of the wall at that time.

The site of the Holy Sepulchre has been regarded as the place of the Crucifixion and Burial of Christ from the middle of the fourth century A.D. The evidence in its favour is mainly traditional and may be found in any Guide Book.

Though I have wandered through the Church of the Holy Sepulchre again and again, and seen all the accumulated evidences of its identification—even the sockets cut in the rock in which stood the three crosses—I have come away every time wishing that this supposed Calvary with its Garden and Tomb had been left unspoilt, unbuilt. As it is, the mass of building upon it tends but to confuse, and destroys the evidence.

THE GARDEN TOMB

The only rival to the claims of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre as the place of the Crucifixion and Burial of our Lord is the Garden Tomb.

It is certainly situated outside of the city and outside of the second wall, though the third wall included it. This is one point of the evidence in its favour. Another point is that it is close, as I am informed by Jewish scholars of today, to the traditional public place of execution.

An effort has also recently been made to suggest that there had been a Temple of Venus built on the site of this Garden Tomb.

What seems to be really a small model of a Columbarium, found in the Garden, has been described as a model of a Temple of Venus. If any indisputable trace of a Temple of Venus were found on the ground, it would be convincing evidence, since we know that a Temple of Venus was built over the supposed place of Burial of Christ to desecrate it. To find definite traces of this Temple would indicate that the Garden Tomb was the supposed place of Burial at that early period.

John xix. 41 says there was a garden in the place where He was crucified and in the garden a new tomb.

Though this place is now laid out as a garden, we have no proof of its being a garden then. There are proofs of buildings on it, however, with mosaic floors of the Byzantine period.

The plaster is all of the Crusading period and there are indications that the Crusaders used this place as an Asnerie, which Crusaders would scarcely be likely to do if they believed the Tomb to be that of our Lord.

As for the Tomb itself, it is difficult to date rock cuttings. It does not suggest a very early date, however ; and the Crusaders appear to have used it in a way that does not suggest they regarded it as the Tomb of Christ. A further difficulty is that there is no trace of the Tomb having been closed by a rolling stone, nor of the socket in which it ran (see Matt. xxvii. 60 ; Mark xv. 46).

The probability is that the exact spot of the Crucifixion will never be discovered with certainty. The only reasonable place, where we should expect Him to have been crucified, is the public place of execution of that period. Learned Jews tell me this was the dark knoll just beyond the Damascus Gate and on the north side of the Nablus Road. This knoll is quite close to the Garden Tomb. Its resemblance to the shape of a skull is quite noticeable, and this may explain the name Golgotha, the "place of a Skull."

What we do definitely know is that Calvary and the Tomb were both outside of the second northern wall of the city, which was the outer wall of Christ's time ; but there is no likelihood of our ever being able to say with definite precision, where this rock-hewn Tomb of Joseph was located—unless we find it with an inscription on it to show it was his.

A visit to either tomb, however, cannot but help us to realise the incidents of the Great Tragedy more fully than we can picture it in our own imaginations. The Garden Tomb is more helpful in this way, for the reason that it is not built over and obscured out of all recognition by later buildings.

VIA DOLOROSA

The Via Dolorosa, as presently mapped out with its fourteen stations, leading from the Prætorium of Pilate to Calvary, depends for its accuracy :

1. On the correct location of the Prætorium.
2. On the correct identification of the place of the Crucifixion.

If both the recognised identifications are wrong, the Via Dolorosa must be wrongly mapped too. If the Prætorium is rightly identified and the Holy Sepulchre wrong, the first four stages would be right, but the others must be wrong.

Supposing the present wall to mark the line of the outer northern wall of Christ's time, the so-called second wall, the Via Dolorosa must turn at the fourth station towards the Damascus Gate and lead to the place of execution somewhere outside that line of wall.

If, as is most probable, the Prætorium of Pilate was the Palace of Herod, the line of the Via Dolorosa must have passed down the street now named David Street into the Bazaars and then northward to the Damascus Gate, where it left the city: or the sad procession may have left the city by the Jaffa Gate and thence to Calvary.

ECCE HOMO

The arch known as the Ecce Homo Arch, one of the early stages of the Via Dolorosa, is an instance of deliberate perversion and wrong identification. This arch is one of a triple Triumphal Arch erected in honour of the Emperor Hadrian and cannot possibly have stood there when Christ was being led to the Cross.

It is genuinely old, but does not belong to the time of Christ. It dates about 135 A.D.

THE PRÆTORIUM

Underneath the Convent of the Sisters of Zion into which is built the Ecce Homo Arch, has been found a paved floor with marks indicating games played by Roman soldiers. This is regarded as the paved Courtyard of the Prætorium of Pilate. This identification, however, is not generally accepted, as there is little doubt that Pilate's headquarters was the Palace of Herod near to the Jaffa Gate.

J. GARROW DUNCAN.

Kirkmichael, Banffshire.